UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/595,204	06/16/2000	Naokazu Nagasawa	32739	1207

116   7590   05/17/2004

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER
TRAN, CON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2644	13

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
      NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

MINSUN OH HARVEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation on 5. NOTE: The request for reconsideration has been considered

but does NOT place the application in the condition for allowance because:

Applicants' arguments regarding claims 1-8 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

1.   Applicants assert on page 2, regarding claims 1-2, and 7-8:

> However the reference does not disclose or
> teach that a "telephone number stored in the
> temporary storage memory is registered in one
> selected from the plurality of the telephone directories
> after making a call."
>
> . . . Rahrer does not disclose or teach that "the
> directory memory for registering the telephone
> number stored in the temporary storage memory after
> a call is selected manually from the plurality of the
> telephone directory memories" as recited in claim 7.
>
> . . . Rahrer does not disclose or teach that a
> telephone directory memory is "selected preliminarily
> from the plurality of the telephone directory memories
> so that the telephone number is registered
> automatically in the preliminarily selected telephone
> directory after each call" as recited in claim 8.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is further noted that in Figure 2A, step

92 shows storing the telephone number in the dial buffer (82, Fig. 1, i.e.,

temporary storage memory; col. 8, lines 10-13) and step 104 shows copying the

content of the buffer 82 into the dial directory (50, Fig. 1, col. 8, lines 37-39) of

plurality of the telephone directories (e.g., personal directory 70, incoming

directory 58, dial directory 50, Fig. 1). It should be noted that step 92 directs the

microprocessor 16 to perform the above steps (col. 8, lines 10-13).

In addition, Figure 4A, step 152 prompt the user to indicate whether or not

the last dialed number is to be added (i.e., manually) as a record to the personal

directory (70; col. 10, lines 16-32). Thus Rahrer teaches all the elements of the

claimed invention.

2.   Applicants assert on page 4, regarding claims 3-6:

> There is no suggestion or motivation in Rahrer
> of deleting telephone numbers after a period of time.
> Thus, there is no motivation to look or use the
> memory elements in Borland. The desirability of such
> a modification is found only in the Applicants' own
> description of the invention, in contrast to the
> requirement that the teaching or suggestion to make
> the modification must be found in the prior art, and not
> based on an applicant's disclosure.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As presented in Final Office Action,

motivation to incorporate the Borland teaching with Rahrer apparatus is

suggested by Borland in column 7, limes 9-11. The relationship between the

references is further noted as follows: In Rahrer, column 17, lines 58-60 state

that each user also has the option of adding or deleting records in the personal

directory, and column 13, lines 43-46 state that the least frequency use to be

deleted. Rahrer does not include deleting telephone numbers after a period of

time. Borland teaches in column 7, lines 6-9 to delete numbers which have not

been used for a given period of time. Thus Rahrer in view of Borland teaches all

the elements of the claimed invention.

3.   Applicants further assert on page 4, regarding claim 4:

> However, the Borland directory does not
> disclose or suggest displacing a transmitted
> telephone number from one directory memory to
> another directory memory for reregistratrion. The
> Borland directory also does not disclose or suggest
> displacing a transmitted telephone number based on
> the oldest registration order or a telephone number
> specified by the user.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.   Regarding claim 4, Rahrer in view of

Borland further teaches a telephone terminal device as claimed in claim 1.

Borland further teaches a transmitted telephone number record directory memory

(103) for storing a plurality of telephone numbers called; and a buffer directory

memory (within 103), whose data are erased automatically after passage of a

predetermined time (col. 7, lines 6-9). It should be noted that Rahrer further

teaches transferring (i.e., displacing) a transmitted telephone number from one

directory memory to another directory memory (personal directory) for

reregistratrion (col. 8, lines 51-61). Thus Rahrer in view of Borland teaches all

the elements of the claimed invention.

3.   Applicants further assert on page 5, regarding claims 5-6:

> Borland does not disclose or suggest "an
> interface means for connection with an external
> memory device" as recited in claim 5, and "at least
> one of the telephone directory memories comprises
> an external memory device connected with a
> telephone terminal device main body via the interface
> means" as recited in claim 6.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 4, lines 13-15 Borland discloses multiple memories can be physically separated. It would be obvious to have an interface device to provide such connection. Thus Rahrer in view of Borland teaches all the elements of the claimed invention.

As such the claims remain rejected.

CPJ